



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/919,105	07/31/2001	Jessica Malmborg	P01.0225	3462
7590	01/03/2006			EXAMINER
Schiff Hardin & Waite Patent Department Sears Tower - 6600 Floor 233 South Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/919,105

E
EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

20051229

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Reply Brief

The reply brief filed 10-26-2005 has been considered and entered.

The amendment after final has been entered in accordance with the examiner agreeing to the applicant's statement with regard to "Status of Amendments After Final" in the Examiner's Answer and the examiner stating "Please Enter" on the cover sheet of the amendment (8-16-05). Claims 13 and 16 will be permitted to be argued independently, as grouping of claims is no longer practiced, these independent grounds should be placed under the "Grounds to Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" not "Issues for Review". Furthermore, the Examiner submits that the words "relation" and "inter-relation" are words that have a definition in the art and need not be defined by the examiner. The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's argument that the Examiner hasn't rebutted the Appellant's contention that if the Schaefer et al. reference were modified to have an appearance close to that of Feller, sufficient motivation is believed to have been presented for the partial modification of the interface.

The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173